

REMARKS

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-21 are pending.

Claims 1, 4-5, 7-15, 17-18 and 21 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Hsu (US Patent No. 5,907,604).

Claims 2-3, 6, 16, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsu in view of Willis (US Patent No. 6,173,115).

Claims 1, 2, 3, and 21 are amended.

Thus, claims 1-21 remain pending for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added in this Amendment.

IN THE SPECIFICATION

In the specification, paragraph 18 is amended as indicated to correct a typographical error. Support for the amendments can be found in paragraph 14, 18, 41 and FIG. 4 of the present Application.

CLAIMED PRESENT INVENTION

Claims 1 and 21 are amended to further emphasize the patentably distinguishing features of the invention by reciting,

receiving in an entertainment system call manager a signal indicating that there is an incoming call during a program play by the entertainment system to a user;

presenting by the call manager selectable call handling options in response to the incoming call through the entertainment system during the program play; and

handling the incoming call in accordance with a call handling option selected by the user.

The idea of the claimed invention is allowing a user of an entertainment system, such as a TV, to interactively through the entertainment system manage handling of incoming telephone calls during a program play by the entertainment system (independent claims 1 and 21). Further, the idea of the claimed invention is providing the user several call handling options through the entertainment system, such as taking the call, directing the call to a voicemail, or

playing a “canned” message.

Further, the idea of the claimed invention is providing a “call management server residing in a telephony provider network” to notify an entertainment system user, such as a TV viewer, that an incoming call is waiting to be handled and to allow the user interactively, through the entertainment system, manage handling of the waiting incoming call during a program play by the entertainment system (claim 5 recitation, “to receive a signal from the call management server indicating that an incoming call is waiting at the call management server”). Hsu is completely silent on the idea of a “call management server … in a telephony provider network.”

Further, the idea of the claimed invention is allowing pausing and recording a portion of the playing program at the time of the incoming call (independent claims 19 and 20).

A benefit of the invention is that the user can take the call and later play the recorded program through an entertainment system. In contrast, Hsu relates to a video conferencing system managing incoming calls with caller image icons using various display devices, such as a PC monitor, a TV, etc., to display the caller image icons. Therefore, Hsu does not disclose and clearly does not suggest the claimed idea of the present invention.

More particularly, the rejections are traversed as follows:

PRIOR ART

Hsu

Hsu discloses a video conferencing system managing incoming calls with caller image icons using various display devices, such as a PC monitor, a TV, etc., to display the caller image icons.

INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 1 and 21

In contrast to Hsu, amended claims 1 and 21 recite, “receiving in an entertainment system call manager a signal indicating … an incoming call during a program play by the entertainment system to a user; presenting by the call manager selectable call handling options … through the entertainment system during the program play; and handling the incoming call … with a call handling option selected by the user.” Support for claims 1 and 21 can be found in FIG. 3.

Therefore, in view of the amendments to claims 1 and 21 and the above remarks, claims 1-4, 17-18, and 21 are allowable, because in contrast to Hsu, the idea of the claimed invention is allowing an entertainment system user, such as a TV viewer, to interactively through the

allowable.

INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 19 and 20

Willis

The Examiner relies on Willis to reject independent claims 19 and 20. However, there is no motivation to combine Hsu and Willis, because Hsu relates to a videophone conference system and is completely silent on the idea of allowing an entertainment system user, such as a TV view, to interactively through the entertainment system manage handling of incoming telephone calls during a program play by the entertainment system (independent claims 1 and 21). In particular, Hsu's system uses a TV only as a display device for video conferencing, and is not concerned with program playing on the TV during the video conferencing. Therefore, there is no suggesting or motivation evidence in Hsu to combine Hsu with Willis.

More particularly, the Examiner rejected independent claims 19 and 20, and dependent claims 2-3, 6, 16, under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Hsu in view of Willis. Willis discloses a system for recording a TV program during a pause and playing back the program. Even if arguendo this combination of references is proper, this combination does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention, because Hsu does not disclose the invention as recited in independent claims 1, 5 and 21, and, further, neither Hsu nor Willis suggest the need to combine these references, as follows.

Although Hsu uses a TV, Hsu does not even discuss watching a program on the TV. Hsu uses the TV merely as a monitor to display information from a videophone. So, a user of Hsu's system never has a program interrupted by a call and does not, therefore, need a mechanism to record a program while taking a call.

Willis discloses a system recording during pause and playback of programs. Willis discloses a benefit, for example, recording a TV program during an interruption, such as a telephone call (column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 1). However, Willis does not disclose or suggest notifying the user of an incoming call through the entertainment system during a program play, provide call handling options through the entertainment system during the program play, and automatically initiating recording the program upon an incoming call. Willis certainly does not disclose or suggest holding the call in "a call management server residing in a telephony provider network" or sending a signal indicating that the call is on hold.

In contrast to the alleged combined system of Hsu and Willis, the present invention as

entertainment system manage handling of incoming telephone calls during a program play by the entertainment system.

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 5

The Examiner also rejects claim 5 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Hsu. Support for claim 5 can be found, for example, in paragraphs 17, 26-27, and FIG. 5, operation 110.

Claim 5 recites:

5. A call management system, comprising:
 - a call management server residing in a telephony provider network; and
 - a television call manager connected to an entertainment center to receive a signal from the call management server indicating that an incoming call is waiting at the call management server.

However, Hsu does not disclose or suggest the recitation, "a call management server | residing in a telephony provider network."

Further, Hsu does not disclose or suggest the recitation, "a television call manager ... | receive a signal from the call management server indicating that an incoming call is waiting at | the call management server."

The Examiner relies on Hsu, column 3, lines 12-19, which discloses a world wide telephone system connected to the videophone 102. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Hsu does not disclose or suggest "a call management server ... in a telephony provider network," because a world-wide telephone system is not same as the present invention's "call management server," which sends to a "television call manager ... a signal ... indicating that an incoming call is waiting at the call management server." The Examiner appears to be asserting that a caller ID signal from the world-wide telephone system makes the world-wide telephone system similar to the present invention's "call management server." However, in the field of the invention, a caller ID signal is not a signal indicating that an incoming call is waiting at a call management server. A caller ID signal is sent to a called party's telephone along with the call (i.e., a call is not waiting). According to the present invention, as shown in FIGS. 1 and 2, an incoming call is routed to the call management server 1 and held there prior to being routed to the subscriber's (user) home 10. Hsu does not disclose or suggest "a call management server," to which calls are routed or which holds calls.

Therefore, claim 5, including dependent claims 6-16 depending from claim 5, are

recite in claim 19 provides, "receiving an incoming call through the entertainment system; automatically pausing and recording a television program ... when the incoming call is received; and resuming the television program when the call is terminated." Hsu does not disclose or suggest the recitation of claim 19, because Hsu does not relate to managing incoming call during program play on an entertainment system.

In contrast to the alleged combined system of Hsu and Willis, the present invention as recite in claim 20 provides:

- receiving an incoming call;
- pausing a program played through the entertainment center;
- displaying a menu on a display of the entertainment center;
- prompting a subscriber to select a call handling option from the menu displayed on the entertainment center;
- executing a selected call handling option; and
- unpausing the program played through the entertainment center.

Hsu does not disclose or suggest the recitation of claim 20, because Hsu does not relate to managing incoming call during program play on an entertainment system.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections of independent claims 19 and 20, and, dependent claims 2-3, 6, 16, and allowance of these claims is requested.

CONCLUSION

Dependent claims 2-4, 17, 18 (depending, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1) and 6-16 (depending, either directly or indirectly, from claim 5) recite patentably distinguishing features of their own, and, further, are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependencies from independent claims 1 and 5.

In view of the amendments and remarks presented above, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-21 and allowance of claims 1-21 is respectfully requested.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: June 26, 2003

By: 
Mehdi D. Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

700 Eleventh Street, NW, Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 434-1500